



OAK GLEN
PHASE II COMMUNITY PLAN MEETING
MAY 4th, 2005
MEETING NOTES

These meeting notes are not a transcript or verbatim record of the dialogue that occurred at the community meeting. These notes are intended to capture, to the best of our ability, a summary of the discussion that occurred during the Open Discussion portion of the meeting, including comments and questions from the public and responses from County staff (and their representatives) that were provided during the meeting.

Public Comment: Need to update the Jurisdictional Control Map and Land Use Policy Map. (Wildlands Conservancy) 11,000 acres are going to open space. It was going to be developed but was purchased and will be maintained as open space.

County Response to Comment: The exchange of land totals approximately 1191 acres. The map will be updated upon completion of the exchange.

Public Comment: Recommendations from the committee's last meeting have not been included in tonight's presentation.

County Response to Comment: The reason the recommendations have not been included is because we did not receive notes from that meeting until this evening, they will be reviewed and considered.

Public Comment: The community has a definitive interest in water and problems with water being pulled out of the community. How can we keep water from being pulled out of the community?

County Response to Comment: We found that while working on these plans, water was a difficult issue to get our hands around. We were not able to get information on long term water supply availability but as we understand it water

agencies see it as their charge to provide water by whatever method it takes to get that water, whether it is through the state water project, etc. That is why policies in the plan may seem broad. Water agencies are the experts on water and are really the agency with the ability to address water issues in detail. They should be included in their plans.

Public Comment:

The entire community relies on rainfall and snow melt for water. We have a large percentage of lateral wells and we can't drill vertical wells any deeper. The problem is that Yucaipa is exporting water (17 times more than they are legally entitled to) from Oak Glen to serve areas down the hill. How can the County help the community protect its water resources?

County Response to Comment:

Water agencies are independent of any county or city. The County does not have the ability to control water districts or water rights. However, the County does have the ability to address new development and prior to approving new development ensure that adequate water supply is existing or assured to serve future needs.

Public Comment:

The Committee was offended by the emphasis on water conservation policies that seem to imply that Oak Glen needs to better manage their water resources while the real issue is that our water is being stolen from us.

County Response to Comment:

Water conservation is a priority throughout California and all of the Community Plans address water conservation. We did not intend to offend or to single out the Oak Glen community. The purpose was more to acknowledge a conservation ethic and the need for water wise landscaping.

Public Comment:

But isn't that somewhat contrary to the character in the sense that you cannot retain the agricultural character without the orchards and cannot sustain the orchards without water.

Public Comment:

The water conservation policies should use words like "encourage" rather than "require".

<i>County Response to Comments:</i>	We assure you that the intent of the policy regarding water conservation was not to preclude agricultural businesses. The policy is really intended to deal with new development and the desire for water wise landscaping, not only for conservation purposes but to maintain the character (natural vegetation vs. manicured lawns). However, we hear what you are saying and will modify the discussion to better acknowledge a conservation ethic but also the dependency on water for agricultural businesses within the community.
Public Comment:	Yucaipa is supposed to update its Urban Water Management Plan. It might be beneficial to review it.
Public Comment:	The Wildlands Conservancy has reviewed the plan. We like the plan and the emphasis on preserving open space, scenic beauty and rural character. We have one concern with the Economic Development Policy ED/1.4. We would like to add “Nature Preserves featuring outdoor education” and “Supervised Adult and Youth camps and campgrounds” to the use lists.
<i>County Response to Comment:</i>	We appreciate the comment and will revisit the uses.
Public Question:	The plan refers to pedestrian and bike trails but what about equestrian trails?
<i>Committee Response to Question:</i>	That was one of the issues we noted in the Committee notes.
<i>County Response to Question:</i>	That can be added.
Public Question:	Were orchards included in the policy that limits the removal of natural vegetation? Orchards are not really considered “natural”.
<i>County Response to Question:</i>	No, orchards were addressed in a separate policy which encourages the retention of orchard trees near major roads to preserve the community character.
Public Comment:	Residents are concerned with trails through privately owned land. I do not believe that most

people are interested in trails on private land. However, we do support them in the conservancy areas. We already have a problem with people who do not live here coming into the area and being disruptive and littering. We would not want to further promote this through the addition of trails.

Public Comment:

The policies regarding trails should be restricted to the Oak Glen Road corridor. [This comment seemed to reflect a general consensus from residents within the community]

Public Comment:

The County retains an 80' right of way on Oak Glen Road. The classification limits the road to a 2-lane road and therefore there is additional right-of-way to work with to accommodate trails.

Public Comment:

We would like to see language that specifies that trails should be "encouraged only on willing and contiguous lands..."

County Response to Comment:

We understand the issues and will modify the plan to reflect the community's desire to limit a trail system to the Oak Glen Road corridor.

Public Question:

Is there currently a trail plan?

County Response to Question:

No, the plan encourages the development of a trail plan as a follow up effort.

Public Comment:

Oak Glen Rd. does not go down the center of the easement.

County Response to Question:

That raises other issues that would have to be dealt with when a future trail is planned.

Public Comment:

The plan needs language that clearly describes quiet as it relates to the character of the community. Recommend using the word 'rustic' or 'serenity' to describe the community.

Public Comment:

(p21 LU1.3) Do not want to 'discourage' less than 2.5 acre development. We want to 'limit' less than 2.5 acre development.

County Response to Question:

Need to keep in mind that there is a limit to how far you can go with restrictions and restrictive language as it applies to private property. You cannot say that you absolutely cannot make a change. Need a certain amount of flexibility that the Board will accept. That being said, the Land Use Policy Map supports the desire to maintain the large lot sizes as it does not propose any land use districts with less than 2.5 acre minimum lot sizes.

Public Comment:

‘Living History’ reference should read ‘Oak Glen Living History’.

Public Comment:

American History is also OK.

Public Comment:

I think the problem with the General Plan/Community Plan is that it is vague and it seems like the Riley Farms CUP is really the more definitive and important document.

County Response to Comment:

This is a policy document which is a difficult concept because what people are looking for is the bottom line. However, the Community Plan is important because it is designed to give guidance to decision makers on how they should deal with actions, like a CUP, in the future. Planners use a number of tools to implement the Community Plans with the Development Code as the primary tool.

Public Comment:

The CUP is complicated, but there is merit to setting standards for development for the community. We feel the plan does a good job of balancing the desires of various interests within the community.

County Response to Comment:

The CUP is the mechanism that will be put into place to help set the standards. It evaluates projects on a case by case basis.

Public Comment:

But the problem is that the CUP is coming out ahead of the General Plan.

Public Response to Comment:

That is why at the beginning of this meeting the Supervisor recommended that everyone go to the public hearing. The CUP is going to be processed before the community plan is completed. So

everyone needs to go to the CUP hearing and make sure that the desires of the community and what is acceptable to them is heard.

County Response to Comment:

Yes, that is correct. The CUP is a public hearing process that is an open process where the Planning Commission and likely the Board of Supervisors (if an appeal is filed) will discuss the merits of the project.

Public Comments:

We don't like words like balance and compromise. You just cannot have rural living with a shooting range in the area. [Emphasis during this portion of the discussion was on noise and shooting activities at Riley's Farm.]

Public Question:

There are good concepts in the plan but there are no details. How can we be assured that the interpretation will not be different from planner to planner?

County Response to Question:

We understand the comment; however, this plan will not include standards. It will not contain standards because development of the plan needs to be consistent with the scope that was laid out for the project and that was for a policy document. The purpose of the plan is to set policy direction for future actions. Partially it is a trust issue, if you do not trust the County or the process to follow policy direction, we encourage you to stay involved through the update of the Zoning Code and make sure that your concerns are addressed through that process.

Public Question:

Will the Development Code have a section that deals specifically with Oak Glen.

County Response to Question:

No, not an individual section. But the standards that are unique to Oak Glen will be in the code and linked to the community plan area.

Public Questions/Comments:

[Once again the issue of noise and shooting was raised by members of the public. Questions were raised regarding compatibility with the rural character, limitations such as noise standards and the potential to prohibit shooting uses. Residents

emphasized the need to point out how important the noise issue is to them]

County Response:

Those things which are incompatible with the community character can be modified; however, it is probably premature to start prohibiting or banning uses. I think we have set the parameters of the Community Plan as a policy document and not a regulatory document. However, we have heard the input tonight and will use the feedback to do a better job of articulating the importance of quiet to this community.

Public Question:

What about cottage industries. Will I need a CUP?

County Response to Question:

Home Businesses are allowed, but permitting depends on the circumstances of the business, i.e. if you have any employees or if you are having materials delivered. The plan does not propose to change the current process.

Public Question:

Was the list of agritourism uses intended to be the only uses permitted? If so this could be somewhat restrictive if someone wants a use that is not on the list, like an office.

County Response to Question:

That is a valid point. It is difficult to anticipate all the uses that would be desired in the future and that is why typically when drafting a standard like this we would use language such as “including but not limited to”.